

***Village of Barrington***  
***Architectural Review Commission***  
Minutes Summary

Date: June 12, 2003

Time: 7:30 p.m.

Location: Village Board Room  
200 South Hough Street  
Barrington, Illinois

In Attendance: Joseph Coath, Vice Chair, Architectural Review Commission  
Stephen Petersen, Architectural Review Commission  
Shea Lubecke, Architectural Review Commission  
Karen Plummer, Architectural Review Commission  
Lisa McCauley, Architectural Review Commission

Staff Members: Keith Sbiral, Planner  
Jeff O'Brien, Planner/Zoning Coordinator

***Call to Order***

Vice Chair Coath called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

***Roll Call***

The Roll Call noted the following: John Julian III, absent; Joseph Coath, present; Lisa McCauley, present; Shea Lubecke, present; Stephen Petersen, present; Karen Plummer, present; John Patsey, absent.

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

***Old Business***

**ARC 02-33 Stratford Company – 542 South Grove Avenue (Public Hearing, Historic)**

Petitioners: David Thoma, architect.

Mr. Thoma discussed the two changes that were made to the building. The chimney issues on the Northwest side of the house were resolved by putting a gable. The garage doors were adjusted per the ARC's request. Mr. Thoma indicated the cornice designs and the materials that were to be used. A Hurd window will be used. The muttons are 1-inch wide. Cementitious siding will be used.

Mr. Sbiral went through the COA recommendations.

Mr. Thoma indicated that the garage doors had conformed to the dimensions desired by the ARC.

Mr. Coath asked for commissioner comment.

Mr. Petersen asked about using a deeper mutton. A deeper mutton should be used. The gable should be wider, but it accomplishes what it was meant to do. Cementitious siding is okay.

Ms. Lubecke shared Mr. Petersen's concerns regarding the muttons. The chimney and the gable on the north are okay. The elevations look really nice. Ms. Lubecke was not in favor of cementitious siding.

Mr. Coath had concerns regarding the mutton width. A wood window should be used not a clad.

Mr. Thoma described the window in detail to the commissioners.

Mr. Thoma said it may be possible to increase the depth of the mutton.

Mr. Coath said that the chimney should be moved over. Mr. Coath that the siding should not be cementitious siding. Mr. Coath said that the crowns on the cornice should not be 1 3/4" bedmold. 1 3/4" at the soffit was okay. 3 5/8" should be used at the horizontal cornice outer edge and raking.

Ms. McCauley had no comments.

Ms. Plummer thought the siding should be cementitious or wood.

Mr. Thoma said that the cost of the windows and the siding would double and that he wished the ARC would allow cementitious siding.

Mr. Sbiral went over the conditions of approval.

Ms. Lubecke thought that cementitious siding was not historically accurate.

Ms. McCauley asked about other projects that had used cementitious siding and what the ordinance said about it.

Mr. Sbiral read the ordinance and indicated staff's position relative to the type of materials that should be used.

Mr. Coath said that the ARC has control over the materials.

Mr. Sbiral said that that was not in question.

Ms. Plummer asked about the back side of rough sawn cedar.

Mr. Coath explained what it was and how it was milled.

Mr. Thoma asked if a lesser grade of wood could be used.

Mr. Jim Lundmark said that the petitioner had made compromise. The commission had allowed cementitious siding in the past and the BOT would have no choice, but to overturn the ARC's approval. Mr. Lundmark asked about the Skor house.

Mr. Sbiral went over the reasons why cementitious siding had been used on the Skor project.

Mr. Lundmark said that tonight will be the end of this process.

Mr. Sbiral asked if the word "clear" should be added to the description of cedar siding

*ARC Concensus was yes.*

Mr. Sbiral continued to go over the conditions. The aluminum cladding may be a problem per the ordinance.

Mr. Thoma said that the petitioner could look into a window without the aluminum cladding.

**MOTION: Steve Petersen made the motion to approve ARC 02-33 with the conditions. Karen Plummer seconded that motion.**

There was a discussion regarding the existing siding under the aluminum siding.

The petitioners asked about appealing the case to the BOT.

Mr. Sbiral explained the process. Mr. Sbiral indicated that good things will not come from this case going to the BOT both from the ARC and the petitioner's stand point.

There was a continued discussion about the type of cedar siding that could be used.

**Mr. Petersen withdrew his motion.**

Mr. Sbiral went over the siding language again.

Mr. Petersen said that a wood siding should be used that shall be used to match the existing in proportion and dimension.

**MOTION 2: Mr. Petersen made a motion to approve ARC 02-33 with changes to the conditions. Ms. Plummer seconded. Roll Call vote = all yes.**

*New Business*

**ARC 03-08 Bussanmas Residence – 628 South Grove Avenue (Preliminary Public Hearing, Historic)**

*Petitioner: Mark Bussanmas, 628 South Grove Avenue*

Mr. Petersen recused himself.

Mr. Bussanmas presented his proposal. Mr. Bussanmas went over changes to his home as far as putting a stoop on the rear of the home. French doors would be used at the rear of the home.

Ms. Lubecke suggested a two-door French door.

Mr. Bussanmas said that the door was a sliding door.

Ms. Plummer asked about the ARC approving a sliding glass door on the back of the house.

Mr. Coath suggested French sliding door.

Mr. Coath suggested two French doors. Also, a wooden screen door should be used.

Mr. Sbiral gave the staff report.

Mr. Sbiral said that there was some question as to how old the existing garage was.

Mr. Bussanmas said that he had older drawings and photos of the property that did not show the garage prior to 1956.

Mr. Sbiral finished giving the staff report. Staff recommends approval of the garage portions of the case. The ARC could approve demolition of the garage.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

*Lori Potter, 32 Deer Path Road, Deer Park.*

Ms. Potter's mother owned the property next door to the property in question. The garage may have been up in 1947. Asked the ARC to ask for full elevations.

Mr. Coath closed public comment.

Mr. Sbiral went over standards for demolition of a contributing structure.

There was discussion on whether or not the garage was a contributing structure.

ARC went into recess at 9:35 PM

ARC returned to session at 9:43 PM.

**MOTION: Ms. Plummer made the motion to continue the public hearing to June 26, 2003 at 7:30 PM. Ms. Lubecke seconded. Roll call vote = all yes.**

**ARC 03-12 Barrington Park District – Jewel Park Preliminary Planned Development – Lake Zurich Road and Highway 14 (Public Meeting, Non-Historic)**

*Petitioners: Park District*

Mr. Petersen returned.

Mr. Sbiral gave an overview of the petition. Mr. Sbiral noted that the ARC must look at Planned Developments based on the seven standards listed in Chapter 11 of the Zoning Ordinance. This petition was for Phase I of the Planned Development relative to the demolition only of the Jewel Tea Building and its accessory structures. Mr. Sbiral reviewed Phase II of the Planned Development. Staff feels that most of the standards are either met or do not apply. Staff feels the petition meets all seven standards in staff report. The petition will go to the BOT on July 14, 2003.

Ms. McCauley asked why there were no standards for a contributing structure.

Mr. Sbiral indicated that this structure is not in the Historic District and these standards did not apply.

Mr. Coath asked about the Plan Commission's recommendation.

Mr. Sbiral clarified the process that the Park District would appear before the Plan Commission on June 24, 2003.

Mr. Sbiral clarified what the ARC was making a decision on.

Mr. Sbiral clarified that the ARC was giving the BOT their thoughts on this petition relative to the seven points outlined in the Planned Development chapter of the Zoning Ordinance.

There was a discussion about what exactly the ARC was approving.

**MOTION #1: Mr. Petersen made the motion to approve ARC 03-12 accepting Staff's findings. Motion fails for lack of a second**

**MOTION #2: Ms. McCauley made the motion to deny. Motion fails for lack of a second**

*Terry Jennings, Director of the Park District*

Ms. Jennings explained what the ARC was approving was based on a referendum. Ms. Jennings read the referendum that was passed in March 2002. Ms. Jennings presented a letter from the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA) in support of the demolition of the Jewel Tea Building.

There was further discussion clarifying what the ARC was approving and why they had any say in the Planned Development process

**MOTION #3: Ms. McCauley made motion to continue the hearing. Motion fails for lack of a second**

**MOTION #4: Mr. Petersen made the motion to approve ARC 03-12 accepting Staff's findings since the standards do not apply. Ms. Plummer seconded the motion for purposes of discussion.**

There was a discussion regarding "Section G" relative to whether the loss of the building would be an aesthetic asset to the village.

Mr. Lundmark explained the plan for demolition and site grading.

Mr. Sbiral went over the seven points in detail and received *ARC consensus* on each of the seven points.

- A) *Criteria does not apply.*
- B) *Criteria does not apply.*
- C) *Criteria does not apply.*
- D) *Criteria does not apply.*
- E) *Criteria does not apply.*
- F) *Criteria does not apply.*
- G) *Based on the applicable criteria, G, the demolition of the Jewel Tea Building will have a negative impact on the aesthetic benefits to the village.*

**Mr. Petersen and Ms. Plummer withdrew Motion #4.**

There was a discussion on whether or not the building was an aesthetic benefit to the Village.

Mr. Sbiral clarified that if the ARC was looking at the aesthetics of the building as it exists in its current state, not an idealized vision of what the Jewel Tea Building could look like.

Ms. Plummer did not think that this building in its current state was aesthetically pleasing and she wondered how anyone could argue that it was.

There was discussion on what would happen if the ARC provided a negative recommendation to the BOT. The Commissioners wondered if this would hinder the Park District from making progress.

Mr. Sbiral said that this would not impede the progress of the petition, the recommendation would go to the BOT with the Plan Commission recommendation and the Board would consider these recommendations along with the Planned Development Ordinance.

**FINDINGS OF FACT:**

- A) **Criteria does not apply.**
- B) **Criteria does not apply.**
- C) **Criteria does not apply.**
- D) **Criteria does not apply.**
- E) **Criteria does not apply.**
- F) **Criteria does not apply.**
- G) **Based on the applicable criteria, G, the demolition of the Jewel Tea Building will have a negative impact on the aesthetic benefits to the village.**

**MOTION #5: Commissioner Lubecke moved to recommend not approving the petition (ARC 03-12) for the purposes of moving the petition forward for BOT consideration and adopt the findings of fact outlined above and included as part of this motion.**

**Ms. McCauley seconded the motion.**

**Lubecke – yes**

**Petersen – no**

**Plummer – abstain**

**McCauley – yes**

**Coath – yes**

**Motion passes 3 yes; 1 oppose; 1 abstain.**

***Approval of Minutes***

Mr. Coath said that the ARC would not do minutes at this meeting.

***Planner's Report***

Mr. Sbiral asked the ARC to look at alterations to Mr. Carlstrom's home to the windows.

The ARC said that the window was not appropriate. Mr. Coath will call Mr. Carlstrom.

***Adjournment:***

Mr. Plummer made a motion to adjourn. Mr. Petersen seconded the motion. Voice vote recorded all yes. Meeting was adjourned at 11:30 PM.

Respectfully submitted,  
Jeff O'Brien, Planner/Zoning Coordination

---

Joe Coath, Acting Chair,  
Architectural Review Commission